

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 30, 2005 and November 17, 2005.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of a certified copies of the priority documents.

**Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract as being of improper form. Applicant has provided a new Abstract and respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections**

**Claim 16, 20, 27 and 28 --- 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claim 16, 20, 27 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 08-149035 to Imura Shigeru *et al.* ("Imura"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

Addressing claim 16, Imura does not disclose or suggest at least wherein said information processing terminal converts the reception digital baseband signal from said baseband processing section into a reception data and converts a transmission data into the transmission digital baseband signal, as recited in the claim. The Examiner cites Imura at page 3, paragraph 0029 as disclosing an information processing terminal. Imura is directed to a personal digital assistant (PDA) in combination with a cellular phone system to provide wireless communication for the PDA (paragraph [0005]). As alleged by the Examiner, the cellular phone provides the transmitting and receiving unit while the PDA corresponds to the information processing terminal (see Office Action, pages 3-4).

However, as illustrated by drawing 3 and disclosed in paragraphs [0018-0020] of Imura, the baseband processing operations are performed by the physically separate and distinct cell phone, not by the PDA 10. In other words, the information processing terminal, i.e., the PDA 10, does not convert the reception digital baseband signal from said based in processing section into a reception data and convert a transmission data into the transmission digital baseband signal, as recited in the claim. Rather, this function is performed by the cell phone which functions independently of the PDA.

Therefore, claim 16 is not anticipated by Imura and is therefore patentable. Claims 20 and 28 contain features similar to the features recited in claim 16 and are therefore patentable for similar reasons.

With regard to claim 27, Applicant submits that Imura discloses manipulation of an analog signal while the claimed transmitting/receiving unit manipulates a digital signal. Thus, Imura does not anticipate claim 27. Claim 27 is therefore patentable over Imura.

**Claims 1, 2, 9, 17-19 and 21-26 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 9, 17-19 and 21-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imura in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,700,943 to Miller ("Miller").

Applicant traverses this rejection.

With regard to claim 1, the combination of Imura and Miller does not disclose or suggest at least that said baseband processing section and said information processing terminal operate in synchronization with a clock. The Examiner concedes that Imura does not disclose at least this

feature and alleges that Miller teaches a baseband processing section and information processing terminal operating in synchronization with a clock (Office Action, page 8).

Miller, however, is directed to a digital bit synchronizer which synchronizes a received digital signal with a transmitted digital signal (column 2, lines 35-37). Miller is silent as to the use of a clock to synchronize a baseband processing section and an information processing terminal. In fact, Miller is silent as to information processing and is directed only to synchronizing a received digital signal with a transmitted digital signal. Even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made had been motivated to combine Imura with Miller, the combination would still not result in the features claimed by Applicant.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Imura and Miller. Claim 17, 21 and 24 contain features similar to the features recited in claim 1 and are therefore patentable for similar reasons. Claims 2, 9, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25 and 26, which depend from one of claims 1, 17, 21 and 24, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence.

**Claims 3-8 and 10-15 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 3-8 and 10-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imura in view of Miller, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0118081 to Philips *et al.* ("Philips"). Applicant traverses this rejection.

The combination of Imura, Miller and Philips does not disclose or suggest at least that a baseband processing section and an information processing terminal operate in synchronization with a clock, as incorporated into claims 3-8 and 10-15 by virtue of their dependence from claim

1. As established above, the combination of Imura and Miller fails to disclose or suggest these features. Philips does not cure the deficiencies of the Imura-Miller combination.

Philips is directed to a programmable modem apparatus integrated circuit and discloses a receiver chain clock generator coupled to the receiver chain on the integrated circuit (page 4, paragraph [0046]). Philips, however, is silent as to any synchronization between the receiver section and any information processing terminal. Thus, even assuming *arguendo* that Philips teaches the features relied upon by the Examiner, Philips fails to disclose or suggest clock synchronization between a baseband processing section and an information processing terminal. Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made had been motivated to combine the references, the combination would still not result in the features claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, claims 3-8 and 10-15 are patentable over the combined references.

**Claims 29-50 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 29-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imura in view of Philips. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Addressing claim 29, the combination of Imura and Philips does not disclose or suggest at least a first interface configured to operate in response to a clock, and a signal processing unit comprising a second interface connected with said first interface and configured to operate in response to said clock, as recited in the claim. The Examiner concedes that Imura does not disclose a second interface connected with said first interface and configured to operate in

response to said clock, but alleges that these features are disclosed by Philips (Office Action, page 23).

As disclosed by Philips, an integrated circuit comprises a receiver chain clock generator coupled to the receiver chain (paragraphs [0045-0046]). Philips further discloses an evaluation printed circuit board which includes a parallel interface and a serial interface (paragraph [0062]). Clearly, the parallel interface and the serial interface are alternative interfaces used for communicating with the evaluation circuit board and cannot be the first and second interfaces as recited in the claims. Further, Philips recites only that a clock generator is coupled to the receiver chain, but is silent as to the operation of a first interface in response to a clock. Further still, Philips does not disclose or suggest a signal processing unit comprising a second interface connected with said first interface and configured to operate in response to said clock.

Therefore, even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made had been motivated to combine the references, the combination would still not result in the claimed features.

Accordingly, claim 29 is patentable over the combination of Imura and Philips. Claims 39, 49 and 50 contain features similar to the features recited in claim 29 and are therefore patentable for similar reasons. Claims 30-38 and 40-48, which depend from claims 29 and 39, respectively, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 10/551,415

Atty Docket No. Q90624

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,



Francis G. Plati, Sr.  
Registration No. 59,153

Date: May 8, 2007